

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

10-26-2009

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 26, 2009

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2009 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 26, 2009" (2009). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 84.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/84

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

10/26/09

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 10/12/09 meeting by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Emily Christensen, Courier, was present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson reminded the Senate that there is a Board of Regents (BOR) meeting this week and President Allen will be making a presentation on how UNI plans to deal with our \$8.4 million cut. She and President Allen met last week with various constituency groups, and based on the menu that we were given by the BOR they have come up with tentative plans but a lot still depends on United Faculty and AFSCME. She encouraged senators to come to the BOR meeting to hear what will be presented.

Provost Gibson reiterated what President Allen has said; it's not just the current cut but also 2010-2011. Over 40% of the funds that we are using to meet the \$8.4 million deficit are one-time funds.

Provost Gibson encouraged senators to seriously think about a number of things. The Liberal Arts Core (LAC) requirement of 45 credit hours needs to be reduced and she believes that can happen as she will not have the funding next year.

She also would like to encourage faculty to look carefully at their curriculum, as we may also need to reduce the number of hours for some majors.

In looking to the future next year and beyond, Provost Gibson stated that we have to think about issues of structure within Academic Affairs. Some of the structures we currently have in place we may want to consider differently because of our budget

but also because of our desire to meet the future needs of our students.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that this morning, Hans Isakson used the UNI mailserve resources to announce a meeting he is having. In his communication, Hans Isakson indicated that the meeting was sponsored by United Faculty.

On 17 August 2009, the Executive Board of United Faculty, the only executive authority of the organization, expelled Hans Isakson from the organization for willful violations of the United Faculty Constitution.

As only members in good standing can hold executive office in United Faculty, the office of United Faculty President has been vacant since 17 August 2009.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

Associate Provost Kopper reminded the Senate that the need to hold additional meetings for the new curriculum proposals was discussed at the beginning of the semester. Those meetings will be November 9, November 30 and December 7. The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) will bring forth the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences packet as well as the interdisciplinary proposals, both of which have been reviewed by the UCC and the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee, for the November 9 meeting. Also at that time they would like to run through some of the interesting issues that have come up that they have not dealt with before and that are not relevant to those two curriculum packages but to future packages.

Chair Wurtz noted that the intent of the extra meetings that the Senate has scheduled will be to address curriculum issues. The regularly scheduled meetings will address normal Senate business.

The dates that the Senate will be addressing the curriculum issues is November 9, November 30 and December 7.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

991 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas R. Berg, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, effective 6/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #897 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

992 Emeritus Status Request, Carol Cooper, School of HPEDS, effective 7/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #898 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

993 Emeritus Status Request, Cheryl Timion, Department of Teaching, effective 7/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #899 by Senator Neuhaus, second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

994 Emeritus Status Request, Sandra Alper, Department of Special Education, effective 8/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #900 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

995 Emeritus Status Request, Lowell Hoeft, Department of Teaching, effective 8/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #901 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Hawbaker. Motion passed.

996 Emeritus Status Request, Antonio Plannells, Department of Modern Languages, effective 01/10

Motion to docket in regular order as item #902 by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

It was noted that Calendar Item 997 has previously been docketed.

998 Category 3B Review - Literature, Philosophy and Religion,

Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #903 by Senator East; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

999 2009 - 2010 University Committee on Committees Report

Motion to docket in regular order as item #904 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Funderburk.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Senator Soneson to call the question.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #904 did not pass.

Motion by Senator Smite to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

1000 Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct

Motion to docket in regular order as item # 904 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Funderburk.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #904 passed.

1001 Proposal to shorten the semester from 16 weeks to 14 weeks

Motion to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator East.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation passed with three opposed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect representative to Regents Award for Excellence Committee

Discussion followed.

Senator Smith self-nominated; second by Senator Funderburk.

Motion by Senator Soneson to cease nominations.

Senator Smith was nominated by acclamation.

Update on Student Information System

Jan Hanish, Assistant Vice President Outreach & Special Programs, along with Mike Holmes, Information Technology Specialist, Vice President for Student Affairs and UNI Project Manager, and Marcos Veloz, Ciber Project Manager, were present to update the Senate on the UNI Student Information System (SIS).

Discussion followed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

895 2007 - 2008 Annual Report of the Liberal Arts Core

Siobhan Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, was present to discuss this with the Senate.

Motion to accept the report by Senator East; second by Senator ____.

Discussion followed.

Motion to call the question by Senator Funderburk.

Motion to accept the 2007 - 2008 Annual Report of the Liberal Arts Core passed.

896 Review/Possible Revision on the Liberal Arts Core

Motion to endorse the work of this Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC) and its intended plan of action by Senator Smith; second by Senator Soneson.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to endorse the work of this Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC) and its intended plan of action passed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that long-time faculty member, Jerry Duea, Educational Psychology and Foundations, recently passed away.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure announced that the Center for Multicultural Education will be showing the film "Hotel Rwanda" Tuesday, November 3, at 7 P.M. in Lang Auditorium.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 10/26/09 1669

PRESENT: Maria Basom, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Michele Devlin, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Michael Roth, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Becky Hawbaker was attending for Megan Balong; Marilyn Shaw was attending for Chuck Quirk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 10/12/09 meeting by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Emily Christensen, Courier, was present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson reminded the Senate that there is a Board of Regents (BOR) meeting this week and President Allen will be making a presentation on how UNI plans to deal with our \$8.4 million cut. Last Friday she and President Allen met all day with various constituency groups to lay out his ideas based on the menu that we were given by the BOR. They have come up with a tentative plan A and a plan B for those cuts but a lot still depends on United Faculty and AFSCME. She encouraged senators to come to the BOR meeting to hear what will be presented. It is hoped that the BOR will accept our proposal but they're not sure what that process will be.

Provost Gibson reiterated what President Allen has said; it's not just the current cut but also 2010-2011. Over 40% of the funds that we are using to meet the \$8.4 million deficit are one-time funds. That will add to the "cliff" for 2010-2011

Provost Gibson encouraged senators to seriously think about a number of things. The Liberal Arts Core (LAC) requirement of 45 credit hours certainly needs to be reduced and she encourages the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) to work with Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, Executive Vice President & Provost Virginia Arthur and her committee in looking at how we can keep the integrity of the LAC but reduce the hours. She certainly thinks that can happen, as she will not have the funding next year so it really is incumbent upon all of us to try to work together to reduce the hours in the LAC.

She also would like to encourage faculty to look carefully at their curriculum, as we may also need to reduce the number of hours for some of our majors. She is aware that there are issues with accreditation in some areas.

In looking to the future next year and beyond, Provost Gibson stated that we have to think about issues of structure within Academic Affairs. Combining departments and looking at new structures or colleges is another possibility. We will have to address some of these issues in the future. With our strategic planning process this gives us an opportunity to envision where

we want to be five years down the road, and some of the structures we currently have in place we may want to consider differently because of our budget but also because of our desire to meet the future needs of our students.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan stated that this morning, Hans Isakson used the UNI mailserve resources to announce a meeting he is having. In his communication, Hans Isakson indicated that the meeting was sponsored by United Faculty.

On 17 August 2009, the Executive Board of United Faculty, the only executive authority of the organization, expelled Hans Isakson from the organization for willful violations of the United Faculty Constitution.

As only members in good standing can hold executive office in United Faculty, the office of United Faculty President has been vacant since 17 August 2009.

Questions regarding executive matters related to the employee organization currently certified to represent the faculty bargaining unit at UNI should be directed to the United Faculty Executive Board, through Melissa Beall, an At-Large Representative to the Executive Board.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that he would not entertain questions.

Senator Van Wormer commented that Hans Isakson is the recognized head of United Faculty and that's why she goes to the meetings he calls.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Faculty Senate is not going to discuss the business processes of United Faculty; it's not the Senate's job.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

Associate Provost Kopper reminded the Senate that at the beginning of the semester, discussion was held on looking ahead to the new curriculum proposals that are coming forth, and the need to most likely have three Senate meetings devoted to that

discussion, November 9, November 30 and December 7. It would appear from the nature of the proposals and the number of the proposals that the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) has received that all three meetings will be necessary. At the November 9 meeting they will be able to bring forth the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences packet as well as the interdisciplinary proposals, both of which have been reviewed by the UCC and the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee. Also at that time, with the Senate's approval, they would like to run through some of the interesting issues that have come up that they have not dealt with before and that are not relevant to those two curriculum packages but to future packages. She noted that these all should be online and everyone should have access to them, and that the system is working smoothly.

Chair Wurtz noted that the intent of the extra meetings that the Senate has scheduled will be to address curriculum issues. The regularly scheduled meetings will address normal Senate business.

The dates that the Senate will be addressing the curriculum issues is November 9, November 30 and December 7.

Associate Provost Kopper stated that the UCC is trying to get all the curriculum information to the Senate as soon as possible.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

991 Emeritus Status Request, Thomas R. Berg, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, effective 6/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #897 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

992 Emeritus Status Request, Carol Cooper, School of HPELS, effective 7/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #898 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

993 Emeritus Status Request, Cheryl Timion, Department of Teaching, effective 7/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #899 by Senator Neuhaus, second by Senator Devlin. Motion passed.

994 Emeritus Status Request, Sandra Alper, Department of Special Education, effective 8/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #900 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

995 Emeritus Status Request, Lowell Hoeft, Department of Teaching, effective 8/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #901 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Hawbaker. Motion passed.

996 Emeritus Status Request, Antonio Plannells, Department of Modern Languages, effective 01/10

Motion to docket in regular order as item #902 by Senator Basom; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

It was noted that Calendar Item 997 has previously been docketed.

998 Category 3B Review - Literature, Philosophy and Religion, Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #903 by Senator East; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

999 2009 - 2010 University Committee on Committees Report

Motion to docket in regular order as item #904 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Funderburk.

Chair Wurtz stated that according to this the Senate is asked to provide a representative to the Regents Award for Excellence Committee and the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee. On the Faculty Senate web page is also listed the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee, the Committee on University Research, and the Panel on Faculty Misconduct, which do not show on this report that the Senate received. Given those elements of

disarray, is there a reason to return this asking for clarification on those discrepancies?

Senator East responded that he would assume that the Senate could plan that those discrepancies could be discussed.

Senator Smith suggested returning this to the petitioner, asking if this would be a new motion or an amendment to the original motion?

Motion by Senator Soneson to call the question.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #904 did not pass.

Motion by Senator Smite to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Senator East asked why the Committee on Committees (CoC) deals with anything about a representative from the Faculty Senate? The CoC deals with elections to faculty committees. What Chair Wurtz noted are not elected representatives.

Motion to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation passed.

Chair Wurtz stated that she will discuss this with Melissa Beall, CoC co-chair.

1000 Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct

Motion to docket in regular order as item # 904 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Funderburk.

Senator East asked if the Senate is being asked to review and comment on a new policy?

Chair Wurtz replied that it is pretty much a new policy.

Senator East asked if the Senate is considering a new policy or are we considering having a new policy, asking someone else to develop a new policy? He doesn't see a new policy attached to the materials he received.

It was noted that there were three items related to this that were sent electronically to senators due to their length.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #904 passed.

1001 Proposal to shorten the semester from 16 weeks to 14 weeks

Motion to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator East.

Senator Soneson asked what information Senator Funderburk would like to have?

Senator Funderburk responded that no data is provided saying that this is something we should be doing. It is a rather large request and he doesn't believe the Senate is prepared to talk about it until we can see why we'd want to be doing that.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure commented that he agrees with Senator Funderburk, and that the calendar was previously changed to its current 16-week fall and spring semesters.

Chair Wurtz noted that our reason for sending it back is that we are requesting hard data.

Senator Patton clarified that the Senate may also wish to request that the Academic Calendar Committee, which he is chair of, also be involved in this with the petitioner, and they would be happy to do so. The Academic Calendar Committee has the research on this when it addressed seven years ago.

Senator Funderburk noted that he would consider that as a friendly amendment.

Chair Wurtz again noted that if this is sent back to the petitioner it's going to be with a request for hard data being added and asking for involvement with Academic Calendar Committee.

Senator Soneson asked if it would be possible for the Academic Calendar Committee to forward their study from 2002 to senators?

Senator Patton replied that he could do that.

Senator Funderburk stated that that would be a start.

Senator Soneson asked if this could be amended to say to return to the petitioner with a request to return this petition along with the study that was done seven years ago?

Senator Funderburk stated that he believes that there needs to be more data presented. He would hope that in seven years since this was last discussed, and apparently turned down by the Faculty Senate once, there would be new information.

Chair Wurtz commented that she didn't believe we needed to tell them what data to look for; they'll know.

Susan Hill, Philosophy and World Religions, who brought this motion to the Senate, asked who "they" is, her? She noted that this came from a conversation with Senator Soneson in their office as they were discussing the current budget situation. By reducing the semester to 14 weeks you would be adding four weeks of time to either put in an additional May term or shut down buildings. There is no additional data. Someone would have to spend a lot of time on this. The Senate can either look at the 2002 report or forget the possibility of even thinking about it.

Chair Wurtz stated that the petitioner will decline to add hard data.

Senator Basom noted that she received quite a few emails about this proposal when it went out. Faculty would like to have a conversation but she would be in favor of having that conversation at the next meeting when additional information would be available. There is interest in at least having a discussion rather than not having it docketed. She would prefer to see it docketed today for discussion.

Senator Soneson suggested forming a committee to look at this issue in cooperation with the Academic Calendar Committee with representatives from each college.

Provost Gibson stated that it's more than just a calendar issue because if we think that it's going to give us some savings on heating and whatever, that needs to be documented. We need evidence.

Senator East remarked that that was basically his question, it was unclear to him the real impetus for this; was it to be a cost saving measure or something else?

Senator Soneson responded that it was a cost saving measure. We're looking at a lot of things to address our financial shortfall. This is not going to be the last cut; there will be at least one, if not more, this academic year. In talking with Dr. Hill, they thought this should be one item among a number of items to have in the "hopper" as we think about what options we have as a university; it was as simple as that.

Senator East replied that we do need data about any cost savings that occur and not just pull this out of the air, saying this must save money if you shut down the university for four weeks, because it's not clear you can shut down the university for four weeks. He's not sure the Calendar Committee considered cost savings when they looked at this seven years ago.

Senator Devlin stated that she would like to second what Senator Basom was talking about because she also was inundated with emails about this with lots of faculty commenting on this issue. Faculty are very interested in looking at this in general and have many pros and cons. A number thought it might be more useful to look at it perhaps in another week or two after some of the larger budget cut decisions have been made.

Senator Patton reported that when this issue was brought up in 2002 it was done so at the request of then President Koob for the Calendar Committee to look at various models of an academic calendar that might provide additional instructional periods. That was the impetus and that was all they looked at. This proposal did allow for the creation of a four week term added on to summer and did allow for the addition of a four week term between the end of fall and the start of spring semester. That was the request at the time; energy was not an issue that was brought up. He indicated that if we get into this we will need people from Facilities Management and Facilities Planning to be able to identify for us what they could measure or what they can track, and any other items of particular interest we might want the Calendar Committee or the ad hoc committee to take a look at.

Dr. Hill noted that the key then would be either it saves money or it generates revenue by adding another instructional period. The question would be how much revenue could we in fact generate with such a thing? Would it be popular, appropriate, a good thing to have a January term? She believes these are things to think about.

Senator Patton suggested that if we do go into this, we might also need a representative from Human Resources to look at contract and/or employment category issues that would occur with additional instructional terms.

Senator Funderburk added that there are two things about this that concern him. Institutions that are music conservatories were targeted and mentioned in this proposal, which set his email off the scale from faculty overwhelmingly opposed to it. The obvious fact to him as faculty is that they are paid on a ten-month pay scale. Politically, if you take away four weeks that's 10% so you might as well be voting for a 10% pay reduction. The state legislature is already calling for salary reductions of all state employees. We actually need a small committee that can get into all these details and see if it's a valid thing to look at.

Dr. Hill stated that this proposal doesn't reduce hours in the classroom; it adds minutes. It's not like faculty will be working less.

Senator Roth noted that the Physics Department remains thoroughly unconvinced that this would benefit our students. Physics students tend to learn in real time, not class time. They need the time for things to soak in, to think about things and make connections outside of class. He discussed this with his students and they reported that they would feel shorted by the shortened semester.

Chair Wurtz stated that she does not want senators to get into a debate about the merits of the proposal; our debate is, are we going to return it to the petitioner with request for additional information, or are we going to form an ad hoc committee to look into this, or are we going to docket this for next week?

Senator Hotek reminded the Senate that we already have a motion to return it to the petitioner for additional information.

Motion to return to petitioner with request for additional information and documentation passed with three opposed.

Dr. Hill noted that she doesn't know how to crunch the numbers or whatever, and it's not going to happen.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect representative to Regents Award for Excellence Committee

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate needs to elect a representative to the Regents Award for Excellence Committee. She asked for nominations.

Senator East asked when this committee meets?

Faculty Chair Swan replied that they typically meet in January.

Senator Neuhaus, who's served on that committee, commented that it's not an entirely unpleasant experience.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked what the committee does?

Vice Chair Mvuyekure stated that he was the Faculty Senate's representative last year and they look at colleagues' work, coming to the meeting to assess whether or not they deserve the Regent's Award. It's a fun committee to serve on.

Senator Smith self-nominated; second by Senator Funderburk.

Motion by Senator Soneson to cease nominations.

Senator Smith was nominated by acclamation.

Update on Student Information System

Jan Hanish, Assistant Vice President Outreach & Special Programs, along with Mike Holmes, Information Technology Specialist, Vice President for Student Affairs and UNI Project Manager, and Marcos Veloz, Ciber Project Manager, were present to update the Senate on the UNI Student Information System (SIS).

Dr. Hanish stated that over the next several weeks they are meeting with the stakeholders involved in the SIS Project to update them, answer questions and let them know where they can get ongoing information about this project. Projects of this nature always generate lots of questions from faculty, staff and students and they will be meeting with the various representative groups on campus. She introduced Mr. Holmes and Mr. Veloz, who are both involved with the project on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Holmes distributed a handout with information on the SIS, noting that one of the questions that they have frequently been asked is why is UNI doing this. ITS has seen the need for a long time to come up with a new infrastructure. For many of the users, the system is working fine and it meets their needs, so why do we need this?

Mr. Holmes continued, reporting that the basic architecture and technology that is currently being used is outdated. ITS receives many requests for enhancements that are difficult to do with the current platform that we're on. A new integrated system will give UNI improved services, a basis for future development and enhancement, and bring us in line with services other universities are providing. This process was started 18 months ago with analysis and input from across campus. Two bids were posted for proposals, one for software and one for an implementation company. PeopleSoft Campus Solutions was selected for the software and Ciber Consulting Services for the implementation project. The implementation project was begun in July.

Mr. Veloz stated that Ciber brings an incremental protime methodology to implementing the systems so they slowly build complexity into the system to best reflect the institutions needs. Right now they are wrapping up the first phase, which is "discovery." By modules, they go through and demonstrate the functionality of the system and evaluate whether or not it meets the requirements of the institution. Where they find areas that don't meet the requirements they list those as "gaps" and analyze to determine what will it take to close that gap. Once they're finished with the initial discovery they end up with a project plan that details out what it will take to deliver on all the requirements that we have as an institution.

They then enter the "configuration" phase, starting with the basic configuration of the delivery system. They don't start talking about any of the enhancements that may be needed yet. They want to make sure that they configure out of the box what the system does and can then verify that those gaps identified earlier truly are gaps and reasonable to work around rather than modifying the system.

Mr. Veloz continued, noting that they then enter the "Complex Customizations" phase, which is when they actually address the institutions special requirements. They will go through the process of delivering solutions for those pieces and then they will enter the "Environmental Adaptations" phase where they take

the entire system at that point and ask how it will interact with all the other systems that will be dependent on it. The final phase is the "Deployment" phase, which will include testing, training and actual go live activities.

Mr. Veloz stated that one of the key things that is currently taking place is the discovery portion for data warehouse solution. A part of this new student system is a gated warehouse component. Those people involved are meeting and doing the analysis and talk about the day to day normal transactional reporting as well as what kinds of trends and analytical reporting we'll need. They are still in the discovery portion but beginning some configuration, and are still taking in a lot of input to make sure they come to a solution that meets our specific needs because every institution is unique.

Dr. Hanish noted that the timeline for the project is on the back of the handout and every office listed has dedicated personnel to work on this project with a counter part from Ciber to work with them. The goal is to have a complete transfer of knowledge in less than two years. We don't want the consulting people to leave with us looking at this great system and saying "now what?" We have to be able to work with it and continue to enhance it. UNI's IT people have done a tremendous job of keeping us in the loop with our competition with our current system but they are working against a very mean-spirited clock. As that clock keeps ticking we face falling further and further behind. There are a number of people behind the scenes making these things happen that make it appear that we're keeping up. If any element should go, we'd be in trouble and we don't want that to happen, and that is part of the motivation behind this.

Dr. Hanish stated that there is contact information on the back of the handout and urged senators and their colleagues to call if they have questions, suggestions or concerns, as they want ideas and opinions. There is a web site at www.uni.edu/sis and any milestone markers will be placed there. They are trying to be very upfront with communication information and make sure the users get what they need out of this system.

Senator Neuhaus asked if this information that she provided the senate on the handout was also available online at the website?

Mr. Holmes replied that they will be posting it there.

Senator Smith asked what the major shortcomings and dysfunctions of the existing system are that they expect to be corrected?

Mr. Holmes responded that they're running technology that's 20 to 30 years old. As new things come out and requests come in, such as to web enable this or that thing, it becomes difficult to do so with the infrastructure that UNI currently has. They are not sure how long the company that UNI is currently using to provide support to the UNI mainframe system is going to be around. Once they're out of business we'd be on our own as far as support.

Senator Smith remarked that it isn't so much that the current system lacks functionality, it's that it's hard to keep it functional.

Dr. Hanish also noted that they are getting to the point where they just don't have the tools to enhance it. Faculty Chair Swan reminded her about the advising components to this as well. The information that they now have to hand-generate is an example of something that faculty members would be able to access and see, such as where their advisees are regarding things such as holds, GPAs or concerns. This information would be delivered to advisors with the new system.

Senator East asked if the past records will be incorporated into current and future records so there'll be a historical record?

Dr. Hanish replied yes, that will be there.

Senator East continued, asking if there's any expectation for reduced cost in the future after we've paid for all of this that we'll need less bodies to do all this since the harder to maintain current software is going to be replaced by something that's nice and easier to do in the future?

Dr. Hanish responded that we will not need the Legacy and mainframe attention we will need now. However, with anything new, you have to have people who know how to run it. Whether or not we'll be able to reduce personnel; that's not the intent. The intent is efficiency with our services. Could reduction of personnel be a byproduct? It certainly might be but they didn't go into this with the idea that people have to go. There is a certain amount of this new system that's transactional but there's also a certain amount that they don't want to go away in terms of the interactions with students. We still need advisors

reaching out to students, you'll still have to grade students, and all of those things.

Senator Soneson asked how expensive is this system?

Dr. Hanish replied that over the entire life of the system, approximately five years, it was about \$8.1 million. That includes all of the hardware, software, consulting, ongoing maintenance, licensing, all of those things. The use ARRA stimulus funds gave UNI a great jump start in reducing the costs and the use of that for this year, which put us in a position to be able to do this that would have been much more difficult had we not had it.

Dr. Hanish reminded the Senate that there will be demonstration sessions of what the system will look like Wednesday, October 28 for the various users, administrators, faculty advisors and students. Anybody can go to any session.

Dr. Hanish thanked the Senate for the time to share this information.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

895 2007 - 2008 Annual Report of the Liberal Arts Core

Siobhan Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, was present to discuss this with the Senate. Dr. Morgan noted that she had asked the Senate to provide her with data that they would find useful about the LAC. She then discussed this with Shashi Kaparathi, Director, Institutional Research, about putting a system online that would allow anyone with a faculty/staff ID to search trends in grades, class sizes, tenure track versus non-tenure track, at the course level, at the category level, at the whole LAC level so if there's any particular data that is wanted they are working to get that available, and which is why she didn't include those numbers in this report.

Motion to accept the report by Senator East; second by Senator ____?

Senator Soneson asked Dr. Morgan to inform the Senate how the LACC approves experimental Capstone courses. What is the process by which this takes place? Can anyone say they'd like to teach a Capstone course and ask for approval?

Dr. Morgan replied that courses are not approved without a thorough review. They are getting better at their approval process and are more demanding of what they want faculty to show them. She often spends time prepping interested individuals on course proposals, including information about how to access the students, providing learning outcomes, and include all the things that should be in a good course proposal in the proposal. The current information sheet that they use to describe the course isn't sufficient because the committee ends up asking those kinds of questions. They do try to be very vigilant about the courses and faculty presenting proposals do get grilled quite extensively. They may ask for more information to be provided, and they do not always approve immediately. If they are not satisfied with the information provided the course will not be approved.

Senator East asked about the course information form, if the LACC wants that extensive information why don't they change their request form to reflect that?

Dr. Morgan replied that that is on her list of things to do this year.

Senator East also noted that the under Continued Concerns and Future Directions of the Committee, he'd like to add some things for them to think about. Proliferation of courses for the LAC, adding five new courses to the LAC a year that probably would not get taught if they did not count for LAC credit. There doesn't seem to be a whole lot of judgment about that being a problem.

Secondly, Senator East continued, regarding learning outcomes, each of the LAC categories has expectations or goals. When he served on the LAC, as far as he could see there was no attention paid to whether or not, or how, proposals were actually meeting those goals. That is something that needs to be paid particular attention to, and how those goals will be assessed, not students being assessed.

Senator Soneson asked if he wanted to teach a Capstone experimental course, which would include material that is somewhat the prerogative of another department, is there any process by which that other department is consulted? When a course is approved that involves material from another area there is always a consultation process. To approve an experimental course like this, is there anything in the

experimental course process which would entail that consultation?

Dr. Morgan replied that one of the items that the LACC is going to change on the form, especially for Capstone courses as they encourage interdisciplinary components, is to demand consultations where there is a strong component. The measure of strongness is relative. She teaches an LAC course that involves physics and math but she has not consulted with the Physics or Math departments. If the course has a significant component that is not within the instructor's expertise, and the committee doesn't see any evidence of the instructor's expertise, they would like to see that consultation. In the revision of the forms they will probably demand that that happens. For university experimental courses that is completely different.

Dr. Morgan noted that all the LACC meeting minutes are available once they're approved on the LAC website.

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate is looking at this in terms of accepting the report, and what we're doing is suggesting things here that might show up in future reports.

Senator East noted that courses belong to the faculty, not to a particular faculty member, typically belonging to departments. There seems to be no measure of departmental support for when a faculty member goes on a PDA or retires. Is the department going to continue teaching the course, and if not, why should we have it in the first place? He'd like the LACC to consider that also.

Motion to call the question by Senator Funderburk.

Motion to accept the 2007 - 2008 Annual Report of the Liberal Arts Core passed.

Dr. Morgan asked faculty to get any additional suggestions to her.

896 Review/Possible Revision on the Liberal Arts Core

Motion to endorse the work of this Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC) and its intended plan of action by Senator Smith; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator East asked if there was an expectation that they might actually get something done this year?

Senator Smith replied that the intent for this year is a lot of outreach to the university, possibly if there's money to bring in speakers. Otherwise there may be something they can do internally. A lot of it is education, getting faculty and students involved in it, and maybe solicit ideas but there's no sense that this year they'll actually have proposals.

Provost Gibson noted that on the information sheet, under "Assumptions" "the committee anticipates that the process of reviewing and possibly revising the will take approximately two years." The university will need changes before then. She certainly agrees with what's presented, but as she said earlier there will need to be revision, particularly in the number of hours required, soon.

Senator Smith asked if it would be possible to make revisions on a temporary basis, saying that due to the budget situation we're doing this now but down the road we will get it right?

Provost Gibson replied that would be possible.

Senator Van Wormer commented that she's on the committee and she is real pleased to hear the Provost say that. She couldn't believe when people said it would take two years; it sounded so academic to her. She looks forward to the Provost meeting with the committee.

Senator Soneson commented to Provost Gibson that there are measures that have been taken in the past to help save money that she may want to look into, such as students with ACT scores of 25 or higher were exempt from taking College Reading and Writing. There are other measures like that that could be considered as temporary stopgaps rather than slashing and burning big sections of programs.

Provost Gibson stated again that she will need the number of hours for LAC requirements reduced from 45. She's not saying how or what courses because she respects the committee but next semester she'll need a reduced number of hours. There is no money; we're in a dire situation.

Senator Smith noted that he would hope that part of what they're doing is to look at delivery modes that might be more efficient and save hours that way. There was a push some years ago to

cut the LAC by three hours, which was turned down by the Senate. He supported that at the time but doesn't support it now. He can see things in the LAC that aren't as valuable as some other things but personally general education is very important to him and we can justify a 45 LAC. Maybe in the short term we'll have to make adjustments but he personally he has a real hard time with cutting big hours. He believes we can change what we do in those hours and come up with more efficient ways of using the hours but for students going out of here with what they do, we want them to be well educated people, and we can justify 45 hours in that program.

Provost Gibson responded that she didn't say she couldn't justify it; that wasn't her statement. When talking about teaching and instructional methodologies there are some ways that the committee might consider cutting hours without damage to the integrity of the LAC, and what's delivered in the LAC. She doesn't think we necessarily need 45 hours, and that's where the disagreement is. We can get what students need from the core and reduce the hours a bit.

Senator East remarked that he doesn't see how reducing the number of hours in the LAC saves money, unless we say students don't need 120 hours to graduate, saying 60 hours in a major and 45 hours of LAC? That's less than 120 and he doesn't understand how that will save money?

Provost Gibson replied that there are courses that are being taught in the LAC primarily by adjunct instructors, not by faculty. Those courses were paid for this year primarily by stimulus dollars and other one-time monies. If we want to keep the 45 hours, those courses will need to be taught by faculty because we cannot hire adjuncts. As a result, faculty may be asked to increase their teaching loads.

Senator East commented that the connection is not the 45 hours, but who teaches those hours in the LAC.

Provost Gibson repeated, we cannot afford it, and we can reduce those hours without damaging the integrity of the LAC.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that previous provosts have thought we could reduce those hours as well and some succeeded in reducing them a bit. They usually have been able to say what the specific number is that they want to reduce the LAC to. Provost Gibson may still be figuring out what's best for UNI, and she may not have a specific number, or maybe she does. Is there a

specific number that would enable faculty to continue on with our teaching and research with the current resources that would promote the integrity of the LAC for any degree coming from UNI? Is there a number that the LAC-RSC should aim for?

Provost Gibson responded that she would be happy with one courses being reduced, very happy with two courses, 3-6 hours.

Dr. Morgan reminded the Senate that last spring the decision was made to eliminate the labs associated with Personal Wellness. She believes that that has had a detrimental effect on the Personal Wellness course, that students are having great difficulty in completing that course with the complications of what was done to replace the lab component. The LAC is very concerned about this and would like to suggest that any changes be made with great and careful deliberation and consultation with faculty. It was a good way of saving money but the long term is bad.

Senator Basom agreed that with the LAC it's not the number of hours, it's who's teaching them. The College of Humanities of Fine Arts has suffered possibly more than others having to staff multiple sections of Oral Communication and the writing courses, courses that faculty have not wanted to teach and there aren't the faculty to teach them. It's become a sort of unfounded mandate for the college, which has to sink a good percentage of its budget and faculty are not necessarily happy about it. There's hasn't been a concerted effort to make any changes to the LAC. This is the kind of conversation that needs to take place but to do it correctly. She has also heard that what has taken place with Personal Wellness had not been beneficial for our students. Which courses? There are some courses in the LAC are taught primarily by faculty. We need to look at what can we do with the faculty we have.

Chair Wurtz reminded the Senate that we are discussing the merits of endorsing this plan but what we are actually doing is fine-tuning what we expect it to lead to.

Senator Funderburk elaborated on what Senator Basom stated, that one of the issues since he's been here is a disconnect between certain elements of the faculty that are supportative of the LAC and another contingent that is equally against what's going on in the LAC. Perhaps the best thing that could happen would be to have faculty staff those courses because that could push this discussion to make some decisions. It's an issue for those that are actually teaching the courses or getting someone to teach

them, and everyone else seems to walk away from it. This is an expensive thing to do and if we're committed to it we ought to do it right.

Chair Wurtz asked Provost Gibson if the Senate follows through on the document that's being discussed, will that carry the potential for accomplishing what she needs?

Provost Gibson replied that it's possible could, however what troubles her is the two-year timeline. It troubles her a great deal.

Chair Wurtz continued, in addition to looking at what the LAC-RSC has developed; the Provost is looking at what we could do to cover the two years as we have the shortages right now. Is it possible to include that into this right now?

Senator Smith responded that he would separate the two issues, saying to design a new LAC but then make whatever adjustments are necessary for the short-term immediate needs to the current LAC with the involvement of the faculty. That was done with Personal Wellness and the argument could be that there wasn't enough faculty involvement. Do the short-term changes to the existing LAC but design the new one to be in light of the budget restrictions, coming up with the best program they can, giving them time to do that.

Senator Van Wormer noted that she doesn't see any reason for two years. If we're going to do something do it fast. She believes they should have time to consult with departments for recommendations but some departments would like to get out of some of the LAC courses. We need to move on, but looking at this for two years and then possibly not making any changes is too much time especially now that we're in a crisis.

Senator East asked if it is anticipated that the committee will consider structural things such as the LAC faculty?

Senator Smith replied that they had talked about dealing not just with the structure but also management structure.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the past year has been spent on reaccreditation and related to that doing the joint project related to the Foundations of Excellence. Throughout those documents are references to the LAC and the need for revision, as well as many comments about the core. One thing they might want to consider is having the LAC-RSC not only work with the

LACC but also the first year council which is almost up and running, essentially the body to carry forth those recommendations and action items that came out of the Foundations of Excellence evaluation. Representatives on this did a lot of work.

Dr. Hill reiterated Senator Smith's comments that whatever short-term changes need to be made to the LAC are short-term changes. Our LAC is more than 20 years old; it needs some substantial revision and rethinking, and the LAC-RSC needs input. The idea that this committee is going to spit in a room and refigure the LAC is not going to work. The faculty will scream and holler and it will never ever work. The idea is that we engage a process of getting feedback, of thinking about things, of disseminating information about best practices in LAC programs across the country, getting people to think about what the goals and strategies are for educating our students the best way we can given the world we live in now. This is not a quick process. It must take time. When looking at the way people think about revising general education programs there's usually a two prong notion; the people who do the general administration of the program need to continue doing that, and the people who are thinking about how to make the program better and revising it are doing a different kind of thing. The LAC-RSC really wants a creative process that is inclusive and listens to feedback and gets people thinking about what it is we need so we can get as much faculty buy-in as possible for what it is that we're doing with our students. As everyone knows, this is a long-term process. She is completely sympathetic to the idea that we need to do things immediately but creating a good LAC because of the crisis is a bad idea.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate has the resolution to approve the LAC Review Steering Committee as it is presented here, with the understanding that the LAC-RSC will not be looking at the short-term situation; that will be a separate process.

Senator East asked if the LAC-RSC will be bringing periodic reports back to the Senate or faculty?

Senator Smith responded that they were intending on being very transparent. If the Senate wants periodic reports, they can do that, perhaps once a semester.

Faculty Chair Swan commented that if there are questions about this committee, Susan Hill is the co-chair and as she is here

today it might be a good time to direct those questions to her now.

Provost Gibson asked who will help her? If the Lac-RSC is going to take two years to do their work, she needs help now.

Dr. Morgan, LACC Coordinator, noted that she will get together with Provost Gibson and provide her with assistance.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure remarked the writing course, as one of the elements in the LAC, is a heavy burden for those in the English Department. When he came to UNI in 1995 there were 36 faculty members; they are now down to 20. They are not running away from teaching the writing course but they also have to teach the major courses as well. It has become a big problem for the English Department as they have basically been reduced to a service department for the university without funds.

Senator Smith replied that at the same time no one would deny that our students need writing instruction. The mechanism that was used several years ago whereby students with ACT scores of 25 or better on the written portion did not have to take College Reading and Writing was not popular with many colleagues. They felt that students didn't learn how to write and an ACT score of 25 wasn't high enough. We have to make sure our students can write well.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure responded that it depends on who is teaching; when he is teaching Introduction to Literature - Writing Enhanced these students are getting drilled all the time. Those students are also getting two credits, one for the writing credit and one for the LAC.

Senator Funderburk noted that one of the other things is the way things are done through the hiring processes. He's yet to see a job description in his department where teaching in the LAC is anything other than an after thought. That shows a certain degree of lack of commitment to the LAC; job descriptions should be up front that the LAC is a central mission of the university and faculty are expected to teach courses in it.

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate has moved to giving advice to the LAC-RSC, things we want them to think about, which is a little premature if we haven't actually decided we want to have such a committee.

Motion to endorse the work of the Liberal Arts Core Review Steering Committee (LAC-RSC) and its intended plan of action passed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Schumacher-Douglas noted that long-time faculty member, Jerry Duea, Educational Psychology and Foundations, recently passed away.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure announced that the Center for Multicultural Education will be showing the film "Hotel Rwanda" Tuesday, November 3, at 7 P.M. in Lang Auditorium. Paul Resesabagina, the individual upon whom the film is based, will be there to talk about his experiences and for an informal discussion after the showing.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary